

Another Comment on “Quantum Entanglement and the Nonexistence of Superluminal Signals”

Vladimir S. MASHKEVICH¹

*Institute of Physics, National academy of sciences of Ukraine
252028 Kiev, Ukraine*

Abstract

We argue that the claim given in quant-ph/9801014 remains untenable in the revised version. The fallacy in the proof is a misinterpretation of the no-cloning and teleportation theorems, which do not involve time and reference frames.

¹E-mail: mash@gluk.apc.org

Introduction

In a recent paper [1] Westmoreland and Schumacher made an attempt to show that “ordinary quantum mechanics is not consistent with the superluminal transmission of classical information”. Their proof was constructed from three elements: the no-cloning theorem, quantum teleportation, and the relativity of simultaneity.

In a comment [2] we argued that the claim given in [1] was untenable, since the formulation of the no-cloning theorem did not allow quantum jumps.

Now Westmoreland and Schumacher have replaced [1] with a revised version. Although the proof of the no-cloning theorem has remained the same, the new version includes an essential note: “...the ‘no-cloning’ theorem in fact holds for the most general sort of quantum evolution described by a completely positive map on density operators... In particular, cloning is still impossible even if we allow measurements and manipulations of the systems based on the outcomes of measurements.”

But using the extended version of the no-cloning theorem does not save the proof given in [1]. The fallacy is a misinterpretation of the no-cloning and teleportation theorems, which do not involve time and reference frames. Indeed, signals—superluminal or not—imply no contradiction between teleportation and the no-cloning theorem: the former is possible and the latter is valid.

1 The no-cloning theorem

Let T be a completely positive map on the set of the states, i.e., statistical operators ρ of a system which is of the following form:

$$T\rho = \sum_i V_i \rho V_i^\dagger, \quad V_i = U_i P_i \quad \text{or} \quad P_i U_i, \quad (1.1)$$

where U_i is a unitary operator, P_i is a projector, and

$$\sum_i P_i = I. \quad (1.2)$$

Let us consider a composed CBA system, the Hilbert spaces of B and C systems being identified. We use the notations:

$$\rho = \rho_{CBA}, \quad \rho_C = \text{Tr}_{BA}\rho, \quad \rho_{BA} = \text{Tr}_C\rho, \quad (T\rho)_C = \text{Tr}_{BA}(T\rho), \quad \text{etc.} \quad (1.3)$$

The no-cloning theorem:

$$(\forall(T, \rho_{BA}))(\exists\rho_C) : (T\rho)_B \neq \rho_C \quad \text{or} \quad (T\rho)_C \neq \rho_C, \quad (1.4)$$

or, equivalently,

$$(\neg\exists(T, \rho_{BA}))(\forall\rho_C) : (T\rho)_B = \rho_C \quad \text{and} \quad (T\rho)_C = \rho_C. \quad (1.5)$$

In words: There do not exist T and ρ_{BA} , such that for every ρ_C

$$(T\rho)_B = (T\rho)_C = \rho_C \quad (1.6)$$

holds.

2 Teleportation

The essence of teleportation may be formulated as

The teleportation theorem:

$$(\exists CBA \text{ system})(\exists(T, \rho_{BA}))(\forall \rho_C) : (T\rho)_B = \rho_C. \quad (2.1)$$

In words: There exist CBA system, T , and ρ_{BA} , such that for every ρ_C

$$(T\rho)_B = \rho_C \quad (2.2)$$

holds.

Corollary: For every teleportation

$$(T\rho)_C \neq \rho_C \quad (2.3)$$

holds (no cloning [3]).

3 What is the proof

Let P_ψ be a projector corresponding to a vector ψ , $\|\psi\| = 1$. In [1]

$$\rho = \rho_C \otimes \rho_{BA}, \quad \rho_C = P_{\phi_C}, \quad \rho_{BA} = P_{\Psi_{AB}^-}, \quad (3.1)$$

the teleportation map is

$$T\rho = \sum_{i=1}^4 V_i \rho V_i^\dagger, \quad V_i = U_{Bi} \otimes P_{ACi}, \quad P_{ACi} = P_{\chi_{ACi}}, \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\chi_{AC1} = \Psi_{AC}^+, \quad \chi_{AC2} = \Psi_{AC}^-, \quad \chi_{AC3} = \Phi_{AC}^+, \quad \chi_{AC4} = \Phi_{AC}^-. \quad (3.3)$$

The proof is as follows. Due to superluminal signals, there exists a frame of reference in which for any time t such that

$$t_{II} < t < t_I \quad (3.4)$$

the states of B and C systems are

$$\rho_t^B = (T\rho)_B = \rho_C \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\rho_t^C = \rho_C \quad (3.6)$$

respectively, so that

$$\rho_t^B = \rho_t^C = \rho_C \quad \text{for } t \in (t_I, t_{II}). \quad (3.7)$$

Eq.(3.7), the authors conclude, contradicts the no-cloning theorem, which completes the proof.

4 What is wrong

The no-cloning and teleportation theorems do not involve time and reference frames. Therefore the only relation in the proof which is connected with the theorems is

$$(T\rho)_B = \rho_C. \quad (4.1)$$

A contradiction would be the equality

$$(T\rho)_C = \rho_C, \quad (4.2)$$

which does not hold.

As for signals—superluminal or not—their only function is to coordinate sets

$$\{P_{ACi}\}_{i=1}^4 \quad \text{and} \quad \{U_{Bi}\}_{i=1}^4. \quad (4.3)$$

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Stefan V. Mashkevich for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] Michael D. Westmoreland, Benjamin Schumacher, Quantum Entanglement and the Nonexistence of Superluminal Signals (quant-ph/9801014, 1998).
- [2] Vladimir S. Mashkevich, quant-ph/9801062.
- [3] Andrew Steane, Quantum computing (quant-ph/9708022, 1997).